IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

APPELLATE SIDE

**WRIT PETITION NO. 10708 OF 2004**

Smt. Abidabi Latifkhan & Ors. ... Petitioners

Versus

Umarkhan Usmankhan & Ors. ... Respondents

Mr. G.N.Salunke, Advocate, i/b. Mr. S.M.Kazi,Advocate for the petitioners.

Miss Asha Bhambwani, Advocate, for Resopndents 1 & 2.

**CORAM: J.H.BHATIA,J.**

**DATE : 18th September, 2007.**

**P.C.**

1. Heard learned Counsel for the parties.

2. The Revision Application filed by the present petitioners before the Government of Maharashtra under Section 257 of the Maharashtra Land Revenue Code was rejected only on the ground that in view of the ruling of the Bombay High Court in Letters Patent Appeal No.349 of 2000 in W.P. No.2211/.. there cannot be more than

one revision application and that being the second revision application was not tenable. In fact, that was the first revision application filed by the petitioners because earlier three Courts had decided in their favour and in the revision filed by the other side, the decision of the authority below was set aside. Thus, the petitioners did not get any opportunity to challenge the order against them.

3. It is now conceded by both the Counsel that in Letters Patent Appeal No. 55 of 2003 in Writ Petition No.7477 of 2002 (Gurudassing Nawoosingh Panjwani vs. The State of Maharashtra & Ors.), the Division Bench of this Court has taken a view that more than one revision applications are tenable and that the view taken in Letters Patent Appeal No.349 of 2000 is no more a good law.

4. Therefore, with the consent of parties, this Petition is allowed and the Revision Application No. RTS 2901/A/CR.456/L-6/CR.57(7)/2004/A & R is hereby remanded back to the Government of Maharashtra for hearing and disposal as per law.

5. All contentions of the parties are left open.

--

**(J.H.BHATIA,J.)**